EXHIBIT AJ [PUBLIC VERSION]

Case 1:22-cv-00125-SWS Document 240-36 Filed 12/22/23 Page 2 of 9 CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

	Page 1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
	DISTRICT OF WYOMING
2	
3	
4	CUSTODIA BANK, INC.,)
5	Dlaintiff)
Э	Plaintiff,)
6)
O	v.) 1:22-cv-00125-SWS
7	FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD)
,	OF GOVERNORS AND)
8	FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF)
	KANSAS CITY,)
9)
	Defendants.)
10)
11	
12	
13	
14	* DESIGNATED CONFIDENTIAL *
15	* SUBJECT TO A PROTECTIVE ORDER *
16	
17	
18	DEPOSITION OF ROSS CROUCH, a Witness,
19	taken on behalf of the Plaintiff before Peggy E.
20	Corbett, CSR, CCR, RDR, pursuant to Notice on the
21	25th day of October, 2023, at the offices of the
22	Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, 1 Memorial
23	Drive, Kansas City, Missouri 64198.
24	
25	

Page 18

Board?

2.

2.2

MS. CARLETTA: Objection, form.

- A. I don't understand. Like just in regards -- that's a broad question.
- Q. (BY MS. WEINBERGER) Yeah, okay. So let's start with you've always worked in the course of your career at the Kansas City Federal Reserve; is that correct?
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. Have you ever had interaction with members of the Federal Reserve, or any staff members from the Federal Reserve Board?
- A. Yes. So in examinations, that's a delegated function of the Board, and so in our examination process for routine exam work, we go out and we conduct the exam and we come back and we vet the exam results, star management, and ensure we're being fair and consistent and the Board is routinely invited to attend and observe those vettings.

Back in the financial crisis in 2008, we had problem banks. The Board would be aware of, you know, our exam reports, and they'd be aware of what's going on. So I -- it's not unusual to have contact with Board analysts for routine exam

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

	Page 19
1	work.
2	Q. Okay, so let's break that down a little
3	bit. So the exam work is a delegated function of
4	the Board, correct?
5	A. Uh-huh.
6	Q. Do you know why that is, like what
7	statute or where that delegation comes from?
8	A. I don't know.
9	Q. And are you aware of what else, what
10	policy matters the Board cannot delegate?
11	A. I can't speak to all the I shouldn't
12	say, because I don't know all the policy matters.
13	Q. So for example, monetary policies, is
14	the Board in charge of that, or can the Kansas
15	City Fed be in charge of that, do you know?
16	A. Monetary policy is complicated. I can't
17	speak to how all of that I don't know how all
18	of that works.
19	Q. Do you tend to are you aware of the
20	Kansas City Fed needing to look to the Board for
21	direction on monetary policy?
22	MS. CARLETTA: Objection, form.
23	A. This is that has I guess that
24	doesn't have any bearing on what I do, so I can't
25	speak to that.

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

	Page 116
1	piece. I understand the master account decision
2	piece, but I don't know.
3	Q. And here in Custodia's case it seems
4	like there was coordination between the master
5	account review and the membership review; is that
6	correct?
7	MS. CARLETTA: Objection, form.
8	A. So what I did and what I observed was
9	related to reviewing the risk of Custodia itself,
10	providing an output that could be leveraged by
11	membership, the membership review or the master
12	account review.
13	So in that regard, I did that analysis,
14	and then at that point it would move to those
15	areas.
16	Q. (BY MS. WEINBERGER) And did you have an
17	understanding that the folks working on master
18	account review and folks working on the
19	membership review didn't want to contradict each
20	other or get ahead of each other?
21	MS. CARLETTA: Objection, form.
22	A. I may have relative to my work, they
23	were both waiting on my work and I mean the
24	output was intended to provide them both with
25	accurate analysis, and so I guess I don't see or

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Page 162

- A. I don't work with the mechanisms of the policy questions, so I don't know.
- Q. And this feedback that you provided to Custodia, did you feel like these were items that could be addressed by Custodia over time?
- A. This feedback, yes, I do. The feedback in this, I do believe could be addressed over -- now some might take longer periods of time, but I agree that it could be addressed.
- Q. Okay. So all of these items were addressable or theoretically addressable by Custodia?

MS. CARLETTA: Objection, form.

- A. The feedback provided here is addressable, yes.
- Q. (BY MS. WEINBERGER) Okay. I want to circle on something you just said. So are you indicating that you don't know if the Board handles policy questions?

MS. CARLETTA: Objection, form.

A. I mean related to the membership, which is what this feedback was focused on, on membership stuff, they were working on I guess the policy questions, the Board was, related to crypto and permissibility, but I don't know how

Page 164

Q. (BY MS. WEINBERGER) I apologize that this document is not Bates-stamped, so it's a little harder to direct you to the right page.

I'd like for you to turn to Page 5 that has enterprise risk management; do you see that?

A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. And sort of halfway down the page in italics it says, "Feedback-These are items that can be addressed over time." Did I read that correctly?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And that's consistent with the view that you just expressed that the feedback you were providing were items that could be addressed by Custodia?

MS. CARLETTA: Object to form.

- A. Yeah, yeah, they could be addressed, yeah.
- Q. (BY MS. WEINBERGER) And this meeting was October, 2022, right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And did you feel like Custodia was going to need some time to address all of these issues?

 MS. CARLETTA: Objection, form.
 - A. Some of the issues would take time to

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 208 that you did not, when you drafted the scope 1 2. memo, anticipate looking into. 3 There's an executive summary of this Α. document that has it outlined of what all we 4 5 looked into. 6 Ο. Okay. 7 Α. It might be in the back, too. Well, to be clear this document has been 8 Ο. 9 before you started the exam? 10 Α. Yes. 11 Okay. So this was -- this represents Ο. 12 what you intended to -- the scope of the exam you 13 intended to perform; is that correct? 14 Yeah, this represented the plan. 15 looked at broad-based -- when you look at things 16 like management and risk management, and you look 17 at things like BSA compliance, our intention was 18 to look at core banking operations, but you can't 19 ignore business plans. 20 So there's grey area when you scope 21 something. So I guess the long and short of it 2.2 is my view is we didn't look at things that weren't relevant to the risk areas that we had 23

But if the scope of an exam begins to

24

25

scoped.

Q.

ie sebteci io inolective onden

Page 209

creep into new areas, then you're moving the goalposts for Custodia, right?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MS. CARLETTA: Objection, form.

- A. I never said anything about scope creep.

 That's a Custodia word.
 - Q. (BY MS. WEINBERGER) Okay.
- A. When we look at the adequacy of the BS

 AMO compliance program, which is absolutely

 relevant to a membership decision, we're going to

 look at what's in place today and what's planned,

 and all of that is relevant.

We understood that Custodia was only intending to launch with core banking products, but over -- well, the vast majority of their revenue and their business model was based on future products and services.

So we needed to understand that, not only for this review, but if we were going to do another review, how to think about these other areas, and all of the gaps that we identified and communicated to the bank were relevant to areas that were initially scoped for the exam.

Q. Was the exam you conducted comparable to ones that you would conduct for another bank that was sort of an institutional,